


Case 5:23-cv-00640-D-RJ Document 10 Filed 01/22/24 Page 1 of 2

id. at 315–16; Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1997). In “order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgette, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

No party objected to the M&R; therefore, the court reviews for clear error. See Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315. The court has reviewed the M&R and the record. There is no clear error on the face of the record. See id.

In sum, the court ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R allowing the case to proceed [D.E. 8], GRANTS plaintiff’s motions to proceed in forma pauperis [D.E. 2] and to amend his complaint [D.E. 9], and ORDERS plaintiff to submit a civil summons directed to the new defendant for issuance by the clerk.

SO ORDERED. This 21 day of January, 2024.



JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge